

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 9-11. These sheets, which include Figures 9-11, replace the original sheets including Figures 9-11.

Attachment: 3 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-22 are pending in this case. Claims 12 and 13 are amended by the present amendment to incorporate a portion of the subject matter recited in Claim 13 into Claim 12 and to specify ECU as an Electronic Control Unit. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Drawings were objected to; Claims 12-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Figures 9-11 of JP 11-246137 (herein “asserted-AAPA”); Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Uchiumi (JP 2003-104634); Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Yoshimura (U.S. Patent No. 6,747,432); Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Yoshimura, further in view of Nakahama (JP 11-313465); Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0052544); Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Yoneda (JP 2001-158578); and Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a) as unpatentable over asserted-AAPA in view of Nakagawa (WO 01/46059).

Applicant and Applicant’s representative thank Examiner Colon-Santana for the courtesy of an interview with Applicant’s representative on April 28, 2009. The arguments and amendments discussed during the interview are substantially repeated herein.

In light of the amendments to Figures 9-11, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Drawings be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on the recitation of “ECU,” the Specification and common usage support the amendment of both the Specification and Claim 12 to recite “Electronic Control Unit,” as discussed during the interview. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With regard to Claims 12 and 13, Figures 9-11 of asserted-AAPA are asserted as rendering the claims obvious. However, as discussed during the interview, the rejection of Claim 12 is inconsistent with the rejection of Claim 13, which depends from Claim 12.

At pages 3 and 4, the outstanding Office Action asserts that, although asserted-AAPA does not teach the ECU being integrated with the other parts of the drive control device, it would have been obvious to integrate the ECU with all the parts of the drive unit 41 depicted in asserted-AAPA.

However, even if, *arguendo*, the feature is merely “rearranging parts” as the outstanding Office Action asserts, that rearrangement precludes asserted-AAPA from also being asserted against Claim 13. Claim 13 recites a traffic control device being divided from the drive control device. In asserted-AAPA, traffic control is included in the ECU 24, as evidenced at least by the control line from the ECU 24 to the call button 10 in Fig. 12 of JP11-246137. Thus, asserted-AAPA cannot teach both an **ECU** being **integrated with the drive control device and a traffic control device**, which is **within the ECU**, being **divided from the drive control device**.

Consequently, asserted-AAPA does not teach or suggest the combination, recited by amended Claim 12, of “**said winch, said electric motor, said inverter, and said ECU together constituting a drive control device** for said car, and being installed while **being**

**integrated with one another; and a traffic control device** that controls the operation of said car...said traffic control device **being installed outside of said drive control device and while being divided from said drive control device.”**

Further, none of the additionally asserted references against the dependent claims cures the deficiencies of asserted-AAPA with regard to amended Claim 12.

Uchiumi, which is additionally asserted against Claims 14-16, does not teach or suggest a traffic control device divided from the drive control device at all. As stated in the Abstract of Uchiumi, the control circuit is used for adjusting and maintaining the elevator and controls the motion, rather than the direction, by generating a traffic pattern, of the car 2. The control circuit 16 is part of a control device for the motor 4 which includes a main circuit 15 for supplying electric power to the motor 4. Nothing in the description of the control device or control circuit even implies that the control circuit is a traffic control unit.

Yoshimura is directed to a drive apparatus for a cooling fan motor in a vehicle and, thus, does not discuss a drive control device or traffic control device for an elevator at all.

Nakahama is directed to a motor with a control device but is silent regarding a traffic control device.

Yamamoto is directed to a cycloconverter and power fault detector and is also silent regarding a drive control device and traffic control device.

Yoneda is directed to group supervisory operation control for an elevator and does not discuss a drive control device and traffic control device.

Nakagawa describes the installation of a control device, but the control device appears to include both drive control and traffic control in the absence of a separate discussion of each control device.

Because none of the asserted references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the above-discussed features of amended Claim 12, Applicant respectfully requests

that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 12 and Claims 13-22, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Usha Munukutla-Parker  
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)